

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1, 8-10, 17, and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pratt (US 6,591,198) in view of Gupta et al. (US 6,744,882).

5 Response:

 Claim 1 has been amended to clarify the function of the profile of the mobile phone. The amended claim 1 now indicates that the profile is used to control how a user of the mobile phone is notified of incoming calls or messages. The present invention compares the current environmental noise value to a predetermined noise
10 value and calculates a noise difference. The profile of the mobile phone is then switched based on the value of the noise difference.

 Although Pratt teaches a computer that detects the ambient noise level around the computer and adjusts its mode of operation according to the ambient noise level,
15 Pratt only teaches adjusting the noise level of devices 140 according to an ambient noise level around the computer (col.3, lines 32-43). However, these devices 140 are not used for notifying a user about any event. Therefore, Pratt does not teach the limitation of the currently amended claim 1 of “switching the profile of the mobile phone based on the value of the noise difference, the profile being used to control
20 how a user of the mobile phone is notified of incoming calls or messages”.

 Gupta only teaches a method of detecting a noise level around a mobile phone and adjusting the gain of the microphone of the mobile phone. Thus, neither Pratt nor Gupta teach adjusting a profile of a mobile phone according to the current
25 environmental noise value in order to notify a user of incoming calls or messages with a mobile phone profile that is appropriate for the current environmental noise value.

As to independent claim 10, the applicant believes that the Examiner has mistakenly assumed that claim 10 contains the same limitations as claim 1 since claim 10 was rejected for the same reasons as claim 1. However, claim 10 relates to measuring the antenna signal strength value instead of the current environmental noise value, and should not be rejected for the same reasons as claim 1. Therefore, the applicant respectfully submits that claim 10 was improperly rejected, and requests reconsideration of claim 10.

Claims 8, 9, 17, and 18 are dependent on claims 1 and 10, and should be allowed if claims 1 and 10 are allowed. Reconsideration of claims 1, 8-10, 17, and 18 is therefore respectfully requested.

Applicant respectfully requests that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case.

Sincerely yours,



Date: 01/22/2007

Winston Hsu, Patent Agent No. 41,526
P.O. BOX 506, Merrifield, VA 22116, U.S.A.
Voice Mail: 302-729-1562
Facsimile: 806-498-6673
e-mail : winstonhsu@naipo.com

Note: Please leave a message in my voice mail if you need to talk to me. (The time in D.C. is 13 hours behind the Taiwan time, i.e. 9 AM in D.C. = 10 PM in Taiwan.)